

REMARKS

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 56 (and apparently Claims 59-62 and 64) under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Abe (US 6,617,784). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 56 is directed to a self-light emitting display device wherein "an angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60° and is less than 180°." This is illustrated, for example, in Fig. 4A of the present application which shows the second surface of the substrate 301 and the light scattering body 302, wherein the angle between the light scattering body and the second surface corresponds to (3) or (4). See also e.g. pages 6-7 of the present application.

In contrast, col. 3, lns. 60-65 of Abe (which is cited by the Examiner in support of his rejection in the Office Action) is directed to the apex (i.e. the uppermost point) of the prism. As this is a different from the claimed angle, Abe fails to disclose or suggest the above claimed feature. Therefore, independent Claim 56 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 57 and 58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Abe in view of Jones (US 5,920,080) and Claim 63 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Shibata (US 6,147,451). These rejections are also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 78 and 79. New independent Claim 78 includes the additional recital that “the light scattering body is made of a different material from that of the substrate.” This is supported by the present application, at for example page 6, which describes the light scattering body (for example 302a) as being different from the substrate (for example 301, see e.g. page 1 which describes the substrate).

In contrast, Abe discloses a prismatic film as a substrate 1 and as surface 11.

Therefore, for at least this reason and the reasons stated above for Claim 56, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

As Applicant is also canceling claims, it is believed that no fee is due for these new claims. If such a fee should be due, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: *January 17, 2005*


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568